



AT-13677

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/393,482
	Filing Date	September 10, 1999
	First Named Inventor	Jerry H. Chisnell
	Group Art Unit	3677
	Examiner Name	Carlos Lugo
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	FTP139B US

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks	<b>RECEIVED</b> DEC 12 2002 <b>GROUP 3600</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	Postcard.	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Remy J. VanOphem
Signature	
Date	December 2, 2002

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: <b>December 2, 2002</b>			
Typed or printed name	Remy J. VanOphem		
Signature		Date	December 2, 2002

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



#21  
BW  
12-20-02

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL  
GROUP ART UNIT NO. 3677**

**PATENT APPLICATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Serial No. 09/393,482 Group Art Unit No. 3677  
Filing Date: September 10, 1999 Examiner: Carlos Lugo  
Inventor: Jerry H. Chisnell  
Title: Reinforcement for a Hose Coupling

\*\*\*\*\*

**REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 12 2002

**GROUP 3600**

To highlight the distinction of the above referenced invention over the prior art as interpreted by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of October 1, 2002, Paper No. 20, no amendments were made to the claims or specification and the undersigned offers the following remarks.

In item 4 of the Advisory Action mailed January 9, 2002, Paper No. 13, the Examiner stated that Applicant's argument would be more convincing if the claims were directed to a method in which one of the steps was to establish a peak crimp area. Although not specifically identified as being responsive to the Examiner's